

PUBLIC HEARING--Nov. 25, 1964

Appeal #7998 Elizabeth M. Price, appellant.

The Zoning Administrator District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried the following Order was entered on December 1, 1964:

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the provisions of Section 7201.3 of the Zoning Regulations to waive requirements for two off-street parking spaces at 3215 O Street, N. W., lot 169, square 1244, be granted.

From the records and the evidence adduced at the hearing, the Board finds the following facts:

(1) Appellant's lot has a frontage of 21.28 feet on O Street and a depth of 84.08 feet. The lot contains an area of approximately 1803 square feet of land.

(2) The property is improved with a three story building which at the present time has one apartment per floor. The building is 68 feet long with a six foot deep rear porch. There is also a ten foot deep rear yard which abuts onto another lot. There is no alley either at the rear or on the side of the property. The building covers the entire width of the lot.

(3) Appellant testified at the hearing that the ~~lot~~ existing apartments are too large and that he has not been able to rent them. He now desires to convert the building into two apartments per floor, or a total of six apartments in the building, which will require the provision of two off-street parking spaces.

(4) There was objection to the granting of this appeal registered at the public hearing.

OPINION:

The Board is of the opinion that appellant has proven a case of hardship within the meaning of Section 8207.11 of the zoning regulations and that a denial of this request will result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to or exceptional and undue hardship upon the owner of the property.

The Board notes that the building is located in the C-2 District; that there are no alleys to give access to the rear yard which is only ten feet in depth, and that the provision of parking within the building is impracticable.

The Board is also of the opinion that there is no undue overcrowding of the property by the addition of these three apartment units, and that the relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone plan as embodied in the zoning regulations and map.